

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
WICHITA FALLS DIVISION**

**ALFRED C. DIZON,** §  
§  
**Plaintiff,** §  
§  
v. § **Civil Action No. 7:22-cv-00040-O-BP**  
§  
**VECTRUS SYSTEMS CORPORATION,** §  
§  
**Defendant.** §

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Before the Court are Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Petition (ECF No. 35), filed January 9, 2023; United States Magistrate Judge Ray's Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation (ECF No. 55), filed April 27, 2023; and Plaintiff's Response (ECF No. 59), filed May 9, 2023.

The Plaintiff's sole objection is the Magistrate Judge's "failure to provide comments, justifications, or clarifications" regarding the reasoning supporting his Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation. Pl.'s Response 3, ECF No. 59. "In the event that the party objecting to the FCR fails to assert specific objections, the district court need not consider frivolous, conclusive, or general objections." *Thompson v. Bumpas*, No. 4:22-cv-0640-P, 2022 WL 17585271, at \*1 (N.D. Tex. Dec. 12, 2022) (citing *Battle v. U.S. Parole Comm'n*, 834 F.3d 419, 421 (5th Cir. 1987)). For an objection to be specific enough to warrant *de novo* review, it "must identify the specific finding or recommendation to which objection is made, state the basis for the objection, and specify the place in the magistrate judge's report and recommendation where the disputed determination is found." *United States v. Mathis*, 458 F. Supp. 3d 559, 564 (E.D. Tex. 2020), *R. & R. adopted by* 458 F. Supp. 3d 559 (E.D. Tex. 2020).

Here, even affording the Plaintiff the proper leniency given to a *pro-se* litigant, the objection does not meet this specificity standard required to invoke *de novo* review. The Plaintiff does not identify the specific finding or recommendation to which he is objecting. Pl.'s Response 3, ECF No. 59. Therefore, the Court reviews the Magistrate Judge's Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation for plain error.<sup>1</sup> Finding none, the undersigned District Judge believes that the Findings and Conclusions of the Magistrate Judge are correct, and they are accepted as the Findings and Conclusions of the Court. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's Motion to File Supplemental Petition (ECF No. 35).

**SO ORDERED** on this **30th** day of **May, 2023**.



Reed O'Connor  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> Even under *de novo* review, the Court finds that Plaintiff's objections are without merit. Magistrate Judge Ray's Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation clearly states the applicable legal standards, rules, and analysis. *See generally* ECF No. 55.